



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,779	02/27/2006	Shenfeng Xiong	199-0459US	9170
29855	7590	02/23/2010		
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 6th Floor HOUSTON, TX 77070			EXAMINER RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/540,779	Applicant(s) XIONG ET AL.
	Examiner Melur Ramakrishnaiah	Art Unit 2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims repeat same limitations again and again (for example see claims 3-16, 23-34).
3. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Note: Applicant is urged to review the patent references used in the rejection of the claims for guidance as to US standards for drafting his claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 9-13, 16-21, 22-23, 27, 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamata et al. (US PAT: 5,953,050, hereinafter Kamata) in view of Takatuski et al. (US PAT: 5,541,639, hereinafter Takatuski).

Regarding claim 1, Kamata discloses a multiple picture output method, featuring: in an n point communication environment, a multiple picture supporting module in (31,

fig. 7) is configured to extract image data of n points from the MCU (fig. 7) and transmit them to the multiple picture server (reads on 31, fig. 7), the multiple picture server converts received image data into video signals and outputs the signals (col. 8, line 24 - col. 9, line 11).

Kamata differs from claim 1 in that he does not specifically disclose: server converting the received image data into analog video signals.

However, Takatuski discloses video conference system automatically selected at reserved time which teaches: apparatus converting the received image data into analog video signals (fig. 19, col. 10 lines 1-8).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Kamata's system to provide for the following: server converting the received image data into analog video signals as this arrangement would facilitate to display video signals on a display as taught by Takatuski.

Claim 22 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

Regarding claims 2-4, 9-13, 16-21, 23, 27, 29-34, Kamata further teaches the following: Multiple picture supporting module in (31, fig. 7) can be inside the MCU or run as independent equipment, it can set up a channel for controlling signals between the multiple picture supporting module and multiple picture server (reads on 31, fig. 7), the channel utilizes process communication technology and can set up a channel (see MCU control signal in fig. 7) for controlling signals and instructions between the mentioned multiple picture supporting module and the MC module of the mentioned MCU, the channel utilizes process communication , and can set up at least one control channel

between MC module and MP module of the MCU, MC module controls the MP module through the control channel and transmits image data to the multiple picture server (col. 8, line 24 - col. 9, line 11), multiple picture supporting module in (31, fig. 7) communicates with multiple picture server (31, fig. 7), the multiple picture supporting module has a control module (reads on 45, fig. 7), data obtaining module and data transmitting module and cooperate so as to transmit received data to the multiple picture server, multiple picture supporting module in (31, fig. 7) obtains the data received and sent by the MCU (see fig. 7) through an adapter (reads on 32, fig. 7), control module is controlled by the top user interface (reads on 33, fig. 7), data obtaining module provides bottom network programming function through operating systems to obtain data from the network in real time and transmits the data received to the data transmitting module, transmitting module extracts all or parts of the video data received and sent by MCU and transmits to the multiple picture server, the multiple picture server receives image data transmitted by multiple picture supporting module under the control of the multiple picture supporting module, the multiple picture server (reads on 31, fig. 7) decodes image data received, turns into digital image and converts digital image into analog video signals through the D/A exchanging module and outputs the signals, the multiple picture server being initialized and can stop, pause, or create image updating applications and so on, featured mentioned above with $n \geq 1$ (figs. 1, 7, col. 8, line 24 - col. 9, line 11).

6. Claims 5-8, 24-25, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamata in view of Takatuski as applied to claims 1 and 22 above, and further in view of Green et al. (US PAT: 6,003,084, hereinafter Green).

The combination differs from claims 5-8, 24-25, 26 in that it does not specifically disclose: use of TCP/IP, RPC, and TPKT protocols for communications between the various devices.

However, Green discloses: use of TCP/IP, RPC, and TPKT protocols for communications between the various devices (col. 3 lines 11-24; col. 5 lines 1-14).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: use of TCP/IP, RPC, and TPKT protocols for communications between the various devices as this arrangement would facilitate to provision well known protocols for communications between various devices as shown by Green.

7. Claims 14-15, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamata in view of Takatuski as applied to claims 10, 27 above, and further in view of Vanderwilt et al. (US PAT: 6,693,661, filed 10-14-1999, hereinafter Vanderwilt).

The combination differs from claims 14-15, 28 in that it does not specifically disclose: shared ether net concentrator for setting up connections between various devices in a video conference environment.

However, Vanderwilt discloses conferencing system having an embedded web server, and method of use thereof which teaches: shared ether net concentrator for

setting up connections between various devices in a video conference environment (fig. 3, col. 2 lines 4-16).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: shared ether net concentrator for setting up connections between various devices in a video conference environment as this arrangement would provide one of the methods among many possible method for connecting devices in a video conference as taught by Vanderwilt.

8. Claims 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamata in view of Takatuski as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Monroe (US PAT: 5,545,700).

The combination differs from claims 35-36 in that it does not disclose: multiple picture display equipment is a multiple picture TV wall.

However, Monroe discloses virtual video teleconference system which teaches: multiple picture display equipment is a multiple picture TV wall (reads on display wall 22, fig. 7; col. 5 lines 41-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: multiple picture display equipment is a multiple picture TV wall as this arrangement would provide another well known display arrangement for displaying images in a video conference as taught by Monroe.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melur Ramakrishnaiah/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Application/Control Number: 10/540,779
Art Unit: 2614

Page 8